9950 West Cheyenne Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89129 (702) 384-4012

Law Offices of OLSON CANNON & GORMLEY

25

26

27 28 Defendants.

(THIRD REQUEST)

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by Defendants CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT (CCSD) and the BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CLARK COUNTY 1

2

3

4

5

10

11

19

SCHOOL DISTRICT (BOT) through their attorneys STEPHANIE A. BARKER, ESQ. of the law firm of OLSON CANNON & GORMLEY, and CRYSTAL J. PUGH, ESQ. of the OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL FOR THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT; and by Plaintiff SARA QUINTANA through her attorneys JAMES P. KEMP, ESQ. of the law firm KEMP & KEMP, and JAMES A. HILL, ESQ. of the law firm GILBERT EMPLOYMENT LAW, P.C., that:

IN CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. On February 21, 2024, pursuant to the Court's Order (ECF 62) Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, pursuant to LR 16-5 this case was referred to the Magistrate Judge for a settlement conference. The Order also directed that if the case did not settle, the parties must file their joint pretrial order 30 days after the conclusion of the settlement conference. ECF 62, p. 23.
- 2. A settlement conference was originally scheduled for June 18, 2024 (ECF 63) but did not proceed following Magistrate Judge Koppe's recusal on June 13, 2024 (ECF 64). Following reassignment to Magistrate Judge Albregts and resetting of the settlement conference to July 19, 2024 (ECF 65), a single extension of time was granted to accommodate Plaintiff's counsels' schedules and the settlement conference was rerescheduled for and held on November 4, 2024. (ECF 83.)
- 3. The settlement conference was not successful. (Minute Order November 4, 2024).
- In light of the Court's Order (ECF 62) on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, the parties have significantly differing views regarding how trial should proceed and the length of time necessary to complete the trial, which differences will require significant discussion between the parties in compliance with LR 16-3(b) in order to come to agreement on a Joint Pretrial Order.
- 5. Defense counsel Stephanie A. Barker, Esq., was out of the office and out of the country on a pre-scheduled vacation between November 22 and December 11, 2024.
- 6. In light of defense counsel's schedule, and scheduling conflicts created by the upcoming holiday season, the parties entered into a First Stipulation To Extend Joint

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Pretrial Order Deadline to January 3, 2025 60 days after the Settlement Conference. (ECF 72, filed on November 20, 2024.)
- 7. On November 21, 2022, the court entered an Order Granting the [First] Stipulation to Extend Joint Pretrial Order Deadline to January 3, 2025. (ECF 73.)
- 8. On December 18, 2024, approximately one week after defense counsel returned to her office, defense counsel sent correspondence to Plaintiff's counsel confirming efforts to schedule a meet and confer conference regarding the Joint Pretrial Order, and outlining nine initially identified potential Motion in Limine topics for discussion.
- 9. Subsequently, a first telephonic conference was scheduled between counsel for Friday, December 20, 2024. At that time one of Plaintiff's trial attorneys was unable to attend the conference due to a personal emergency. The conference was re-scheduled for Monday, December 22, 2024.
- 10. On Monday, December 22, 2024, the parties held their first telephonic meet and confer conference regarding the Joint Pretrial Order. Therein the parties discussed their differing views of the remaining legal and factual issues for trial, and the potential scope of the evidence as related to each party's view. Counsel agreed that a draft Joint Pretrial Order would assist the parties' efforts to define the remaining legal and factual issues. Accordingly, counsel for Plaintiffs agreed to provide a proposed draft of the Joint Pretrial Order to defense counsel on or before Friday, December 27, 2024.
- 11. A subsequent telephonic meet and confer was scheduled for January 2, 2025.
- 12. On December 26, 2024, the parties submitted a second Stipulation To Extend Joint Pretrial Order Deadline (Second Request) to January 17, 2025, seeking an additional two weeks to settle remaining disputes regarding the scope of the evidence to be presented at trial. (ECF 74, filed on December 26, 2024.)
- 13. On January 2, 2025, the court entered an Order Granting the [Second] Stipulation to Extend Joint Pretrial Order Deadline to January 17, 2025. (ECF 75.)
- 14. Since that date the parties have exchanged multiple drafts of the proposed Joint Pretrial Memorandum (December 27, 2024, and January 9, 16, and 17, 2025) and have

engaged in telephonic meet and confer conferences regarding the content of those drafts on January 10, January 13, 2025. The fourth revision of the proposed Joint Pretrial Order is currently being reviewed by Plaintiff's counsel.

- 15. Plaintiff's counsel has experienced scheduling conflicts in the past few days, and is currently under the weather, thus impeding completion of the Joint Pretrial Memorandum by today's January 17, 2025, deadline.
- 16. The parties, therefore, request the current January 17, 2025, due date for submission of the Joint Pretrial Order be extended an additional three (3) court days to Thursday, January 23, 2025, to allow adequate time for the parties to complete their review and discussion regarding the fourth draft of the proposed Joint Pretrial Order currently under review.
- 17. This is the parties' third Stipulation to Extend the Joint Pretrial Order deadline. It is not submitted for the purpose of delay, but rather is submitted in a good faith effort to narrow and define the scope of the issues to be presented at trial.

1 NOW THEREFORE, THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE that the deadline to file the 2 Joint Pretrial Order be extended for three additional court days to January 23, 2025. 3 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED. 4 DATED this 17th day of Jan., 2025. DATED this 17th day of Jan., 2025. 5 **OLSON CANNON & GORMLEY** KEMP & KEMP 6 1st Stephanie N. Barker /s/ James P. Kemp 7 JAMES P. KEMP, ESQ. STEPHANIE A. BARKER, ESO. 8 Nevada Bar No. 6375 Nevada Bar No. 3176 VICTORIA L. NEAL, ESO. THOMAS D. DILLARD, JR., ESQ. 9 Nevada Bar No. 13382 Nevada Bar No. 6270 7435 W. Azure Drive, Suite 110 STEPHANIE M. ZINNA, ESQ. 10 Las Vegas, NV 89130 Nevada Bar No. 11488 ip@kemp-attorneys.com 9950 West Cheyenne Avenue 11 vneal@kemp-attorneys.com Las Vegas, NV 89129 sbarker@ocgattorneys.com 12 tdillard@ocgattorneys.com AND szinna@ocgattorneys.com 13 GILBERT EMPLOYMENT LAW, PC JAMES A. HILL, ESQ. AND 14 Pro Hac Vice - ECF 24 Law Offices of OLSON CANNON & GORMLEY A Professional Corporation 9950 West Cheyeme Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89129 (702) 384-4012 8403 Colesville Road, Ste. 1000 OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL, CCSD 15 CRYSTAL J. PUGH, ESQ. Silver Spring, MD 20910 Nevada Bar No. 012396 ihill@gelawyer.com 16 5100 West Sahara Avenue 17 Attorneys for Plaintiff Las Vegas, NV 89146 Sara Quintana Herrec4@nv.ccsd.net 18 Attorneys for Defendants 19 Clark County School District and Board of Trustees of the Clark County School District 20 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 DATED: 1-21-25 23 24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 25 26 27 28

Page 5 of 5